



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/619,672	07/14/2003	Nicholas Paul Cowley	MARSP0169US	7076		
43076	43076 7590 12/01/2005			EXAMINER		
	SARALINO (GENERAL)	VO, NGUYEN THANH				
	OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLA ID AVENUE, NINETEENTI	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
CLEVELAND, OH 44115-2191			2685			
			DATE MAILED: 12/01/2005	5		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application N	lo.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/619,672		COWLEY ET AL.				
		Examiner		Art Unit				
		Nguyen T. Vo		2685				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communica or Reply	ation appears on the co	ver sheet with the d	correspondence ad	Idress			
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAI assions of time may be available under the provisions of SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this commun period for reply is specified above, the maximum statut re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will reply received by the Office later than three months after the part of the provision of the pr	ILING DATE OF THIS (37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, h ication. tory period will apply and will exp I, by statute, cause the application	COMMUNICATION owever, may a reply be tinding oire SIX (6) MONTHS from on to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed n the mailing date of this c ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	•			
Status								
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed	on						
· —)⊠ This action is non-	final					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the matters.								
,—	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposit	ion of Claims		,					
4)⊠)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-8</u> is/are pending in the application.							
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
_	Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
-	Claim(s) <u>1-3 and 6-8</u> is/are rejected.							
	Claim(s) <u>4 and 5</u> is/are objected to.							
8)□	Claim(s) are subject to restriction	on and/or election requ	irement.					
Applicati	ion Papers							
9) ⊠	The specification is objected to by the I	Examiner						
	The drawing(s) filed on 14 July 2003 is.		b) objected to	by the Examiner.				
•	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the			• •	FR 1.121(d).			
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to b	y the Examiner. Note t	he attached Office	e Action or form P	ГО-152.			
Priority ι	under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim fo ☑ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:	r foreign priority under	35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).				
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
	2. Certified copies of the priority do	ocuments have been re	ceived in Applicat	ion No				
	3. Copies of the certified copies of	•		ed in this National	Stage			
	application from the International							
* \$	See the attached detailed Office action t	for a list of the certified	copies not receive	ed.				
Attachmen		,						
1) Notice 2) Notice	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTC	4) (0-948)	Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D					
3) 🛛 Infori	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PT r No(s)/Mail Date	TO/SB/08) 5) [6) [Notice of Informal F	Patent Application (PTG	O-152)			

Application/Control Number: 10/619,672 Page 2

Art Unit: 2685

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 - The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 3. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

There are two claims 5 in the present application. It is suggested that the first claim 5 should be changed to claim 3.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g)

6. Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the prior art as admitted by applicant on pages 1-2 of the present specification (hereinafter simply referred to as the admitted prior art) in view of Muschallik (US 2004/0087279 A1, cited by examiner).

As to claim 1, the admitted prior art discloses a single conversion tuner for digital terrestrial broadcast signals, comprising a tuner input; a single frequency changer for converting any selected one of a plurality of channels to a non-zero output intermediate frequency for demodulation, said frequency changer comprising an image reject mixer and a local oscillator ranged to supply to said mixer a local oscillator signal (see page 1 of the present specification). The admitted prior art fails to disclose the local oscillator having a frequency which is substantially equal to a sum of a frequency of said selected channel and said output intermediate frequency; and a non-alignable low pass filter having a turnover frequency and being arranged to track said frequency of said local oscillator such that said turnover frequency of said low pass filter is greater than said frequency of said selected channel and less than a sum of said frequency of said selected channel and twice said output intermediate frequency. Muschallik discloses a tuner (see block 1 in figure 1) comprising a tuner input (see the input to block 1 in figure 1); a single frequency changer (see the frequency converter 11, 12; see also paragraph [0070]) for converting any selected one of a plurality of channels to a non-zero output

intermediate frequency for demodulation (in this case, the non-zero output IF as claimed reads on the low IF at paragraph [0075]), said frequency changer comprising an image reject mixer (see "the image rejection mixing" at paragraph [0075]) and a local oscillator 40 (see figure 1) arranged to supply to said mixer a local oscillator signal having a frequency which is substantially equal to a sum of a frequency of said selected channel and said output intermediate frequency (see paragraph [0080]); and a non-alignable low pass filter (see filters 22-23 in figure 1; see also paragraph [0075]) having a turnover frequency and being arranged to track said frequency of said local oscillator such that said turnover frequency of said low pass filter is greater than said frequency of said selected channel and less than a sum of said frequency of said selected channel and twice said output intermediate frequency (see paragraphs [0075], [0098]; see also figures 4-6). In addition, Muschallik does not state that the low pass filters 22-23 must be aligned during manufacture. Accordingly, the filters 22-23 reads on "non-alignable" low pass filter" as claimed for the broadest reasonable interpretations. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the above teaching of Muschallik to the admitted prior art, in order to provide for the effective provision of anti-aliasing filtering depending on the frequency synthesis

As to claim 2, the above combination of the admitted prior art and Muschallik fails to disclose that the low pass filter provides 15 decibels of attenuation as claimed.

Those skilled in the art, however, would have recognized that the above limitations would not render the claim patentable over the combination of the admitted prior art and

method (as suggested by Muschallik at paragraph [0032]).

Page 5

Art Unit: 2685

Muschallik because it would merely depend on how much attenuation one would like to provide to his filter. In addition, the examiner takes Official Notice that such a filter which provides 15 decibels of attenuation is known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination of the admitted prior art and Muschallik such that the low pass filter provides 15 decibels of attenuation, in order to improve received signal quality because more unwanted signals would be attenuated.

7. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art in view of Muschallik as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Katsuyama (6,112,070, cited by applicant).

As to claim 3, the above combination of the admitted prior art and Muschallik fails to disclose a digital/analog converter for controlling said low pass filter and a memory containing a look-up table for receiving a channel request and for supplying filter tuning data to said converter as claimed. Katsuyama discloses in figure 4 a digital/analog converter 12 for controlling a variable filter 4 and a memory containing a look-up table (included in CPU 13 as disclosed at column 9 lines 5-8) for receiving a channel request and for supplying filter tuning data to said converter (see column 8 line 60 to column 9 line 20). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the above teaching of Katsuyama to the above combination, in order to enlarge the degree of freedom in designing the variable filter (as suggested by Katsuyama at column 9 lines 17-19).

Application/Control Number: 10/619,672 Page 6

Art Unit: 2685

8. Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art in view of Muschallik as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Hayashi (6,909,882, cited by examiner).

As to claims 6-8, the above combination of the admitted prior art and Muschallik fails to disclose a variable low noise amplifier and a band limit filter between the tuner input and the low pass filter as claimed. Hayashi discloses a variable low noise amplifier 112A (see figure 2) and a band limit filter 111 (see figure 2) between a tuner input (see the antenna input in figure 2) and a low pass filter (see LPF2 in figure 4). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the above teaching of Hayashi to the above combination, in order to remove spurious waves from a signal received by the antenna (as suggested by Hayashi at column 6 lines 6-9).

Allowable Subject Matter

9. Claims 4-5 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

As to claim 4, the applied references fails to disclose or render obvious the combination of the low pass filter and a non-alignable high pass filter, wherein the high pass filter having a turnover frequency and a variable bandwidth and located between said tuner input and said frequency changer as claimed.

Conclusion

Application/Control Number: 10/619,672 Page 7

Art Unit: 2685

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Galal (6,161,004) discloses rejecting image signals in a receiver.

Cowley (US 2004/0266376) discloses a receiver tuner.

Python (6,915,121) discloses integrated tunable filter for broadband tuner.

Isberg (6,029,052) and Loper (5,179,730) both disclose direct conversion receiver.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nguyen T. Vo whose telephone number is (571) 272-7901. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward Urban can be reached on (571)272-7899. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nguyen Vo

MguyeV6 11_27_2005 NGUYENT.VO

PRIMARY EXAMINER